

P22



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,660	06/28/2001	Justin Chickles	5150-43101	1628

7590 02/27/2004

Jeffrey C. Hood
Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/894,660

Applicant(s)

CHICKLES ET AL.

Examin r

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunicati n appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

On line 6, "may be provided", "for example" should be avoided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-23, 29-38 and 40-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. [US. 6,061,061] in view of Mangat et al. [US. 6,081,814].

As to claims 1 and 32, Conrad et al. discloses displaying one or more windows of a program currently being edited on the display (figure 2 E, windows 23, 24, 25 are being opened and edited); incorporating the selected program element in a first window of the one or more windows of the program (figure 2A-2B, column 4, lines 42-55, "Figure 2A-2F, illustrates basic drag operations using spring-loaded enclosures.

In FIG 2A, the identifier 30 in window 24 is selected for drag operation by moving the cursor 50 over the icon 30, depressing the mouse button and dragging the cursor along a path while holding the mouse and dragging the cursor along a path 51 while holding the mouse button down. The user pauses the cursor over identifier and causes a temporary window 52, shown in FIG 2B, to open substantially centered over the cursor, and thus over identifier 27"). The difference between Conrad et al. and the claim is displaying a search window on the display; receiving user input in the search window specifying a search criteria; identifying and displaying information regarding a plurality of possible program elements in the search window in accordance with the search criteria user input; receiving user input for selecting a program element from the plurality of possible program elements. Mangat et al. shows displaying a search window on the display and receiving user input in the search window specifying a search criteria (column 3, lines 1-5 and lines 55-68); identifying and displaying information regarding a plurality of possible program elements in the search window in accordance with the search criteria user input and receiving user input selecting a program element from the plurality of possible program elements (column 11, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Conrad et al. and Mangat et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the concept of dragging, dropping and incorporating a program object in a window as taught by Conrad et al. to include the searching list of program elements of Mangat et al., for the purpose of providing a method for easily locating a desired item among the list of program elements into a window as taught by Mangat et al.

As to claims 2-4, 13 and 33-35, while Mangat et al. also discloses the search window, Conrad et al. teaches adding functionality, a particular graphical user interface function to the window of the program currently being edited and a particular computer executable function associated with the particular function element (figure 2E, windows 23, 24, 25 are opened and edited and element (30) is the particular GUI function, column 4, lines 40-55).

As to claims 5, 14, 36, 42, 50 and 53, Conrad et al. also teaches receiving user input to drag-and-drop the selected program element into the first window (column 5, lines 15-30).

As to claims 6, 15 and 21, Mangat et al. teaches searching for the search string in a plurality of text items comprising text items related to the program elements; and displaying one or more text items located by said searching for the search string, wherein each of the one or more located text items includes the search string, and wherein each of the one or more located text items references one of the plurality of possible program elements (column 11, lines 10-20).

As to claims 7 and 16, Mangat et al. also teaches the user input selecting the program element from the plurality of possible program elements specifies one of the one or more located text items, wherein the specified located text item references the selected program element (column 9, line 55 through column 10, line 5).

As to claims 8 and 38, Mangat et al. shows the graphical user interface comprising a hierarchy of palette windows, wherein one or more of the palette windows in the hierarchy each comprise one or more palette items that each represent one of the plurality of possible program elements (column 10, lines 50-67).

As to claim 10, Mangat et al. also shows displaying the search window being performed in response to user input to the graphical user interface (column 9, line 55 through column 10, line 5).

As to claims 11, 20, 40, 44, 52 and 54, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 8 and 10. The first and second windows are taught in figures 1-2.

As to claim 12, Conrad et al. shows wherein the palette items including icons that are selectable by the user to incorporate graphical user interface elements in a graphical user interface of the program currently being edited (column 5, lines 12-28).

As to claim 17, Conrad et al. also shows the plurality of possible palette items including palette items from the one or more of the palette windows in the hierarchy comprising palette items (figure 1, each palette window (23, 24, 25) contains palette items (26, 27, 28, 29, 31).

As to claims 18 and 23, Conrad et al. provides the plurality of possible palette items including palette items from a plurality of hierarchies of palette windows (column 11, lines 43-55).

As to claim 22, Mangat et al. also provides the user input selecting the new palette window from the plurality of possible palette windows specifies one of the one or more located text items in the search window, wherein the specified located text item references the new palette window (column 10, lines 30-48).

As to claim 29, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 4 and 13.

As to claims 30 and 47, Conrad et al. also demonstrates the program is a graphical program, and wherein the palette items include icons that are selectable by the user to add functionality to the graphical program (figure 2A, (23, 24).

As to claims 31 and 48, in combination of Conrad et al. and Mangat et al., they teaches the information regarding the plurality of possible palette windows displayed in the search window includes information regarding one or more possible program elements (Mangat et al, column 10, lines 15-25), wherein the information regarding the one or more possible program elements is selectable by the user from the search window to add functionality to the program (Conrad, figure 2A).

As to claims 37, 43 and 45, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 6-7.

As to claim 41, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 12-13.

As to claim 46, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 24-25.

As to claim 49, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-2.

As to claim 51, Conrad et al. discloses the graphical user interface comprising a hierarchy of palette windows, wherein one or more of the palette windows in the hierarchy each comprise one or more palette items that each represent one of the plurality of possible program elements (column 5, lines 13-45).

Claims 9, 19, 24-28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. in view of Mangat et al. and further in view of Patil et al. [US. 6,489,975].

As to claims 9, 19 and 39, the difference between Conrad et al., Mangat et al. and the claim is navigation items for navigating among the hierarchy of palette windows, wherein the navigation items include one or more of a forward navigation item, a backward navigation item, and an up navigation item. Patil et al. shows the feature at column 4, lines 45-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Conrad et al., Mangat et al. and Patil et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the method of adding program elements to programs in a GUI as taught by Conrad et al. and Mangat et al. to include the navigation between windows of Patil et al., with the motivation to be efficient for searching for items in a hierarchy of palette windows as taught by Patil et al.

As to claim 24, Patil et al. demonstrates prior to said displaying the search window in response to said user input selecting the search item: receiving user input selecting a navigation item displayed on the search window (figure 2, 54); and displaying a previously displayed palette window in the hierarchy of palette windows in response to said user input selecting the navigation item (figure 2, 46).

As to claim 25, Patil et al. also demonstrates the navigation item is one of a forward navigation item, a back navigation item, and an up navigation item (figure 2, 40).

As to claim 26-28, Patil et al. discloses the navigation item being a back navigation item operable when selected to display a most recently previously displayed palette window in a backward direction; the navigation item being a forward navigation item operable when selected to display a most recently previously displayed palette

Art Unit: 2174

window in a forward direction and the navigation item being an up navigation item operable when selected to display a parent palette window of the first palette window, regardless of the most recently previously displayed palette window (column 4, lines 35-55).

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 872-9306 for all kind of communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100